

Date: Tue, 4 Oct 94 04:30:17 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: List
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #476
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 4 Oct 94 Volume 94 : Issue 476

Today's Topics:

 900mhz phone questions.
 Glass houses and those who live in them (2 msgs)
 Is this a Part 97 violation? (2 msgs)
 Necessary power (was Re: Glass houses
Necessary power (was Re: Glass houses and those who live in the) (3 msgs)
 Scarborough Reef - DXCC status
 Singapore's Ham Laws (or: we've got it easy in the US)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>

Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>

Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 4 Oct 94 02:21:47 GMT
From: xenolith@halcyon.COM (Kevin Purcell)
Subject: 900mhz phone questions.

But you would be in violation for using an illegal spreading function with
a spread spectrum phone> Check out part 97 and the Spreadspectrum handbook
for details.

IMHO a silly rule but there you are:

1. operate at < 1 W in Part 15 and use any spreading function that meets
the Part 15 specs

OR

2. operate at > 1 w in Part 97.

Kevin Purcell N7WIM / G8UDP xenolith@halcyon.com 206/649-6489
Seattle dBug Mac Developers SIG organiser kevinpu@atm.com

Date: 3 Oct 94 12:34:36 GMT
From: William=E.=Newkirk%Pubs%GenAv.Mlb@ns14.cca.rockwell.COM
Subject: Glass houses and those who live in them

>Remember that the regulations *require* that we run as little
>power as possible!
>Jeff NH6IL

not exactly. the rule reads you are to use the least power needed for a
reliable contact....reduce power? fine...but if the other station has to give
valid signal reports first...

bill wb9ivr

Date: Mon, 3 Oct 1994 15:50:30 GMT
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
Subject: Glass houses and those who live in them

William=E.=Newkirk%Pubs%GenAv.Mlb@ns14.cca.rockwell.COM writes:

>>Remember that the regulations *require* that we run as little
>>power as possible!
>>Jeff NH6IL

>not exactly. the rule reads you are to use the least power needed for a
>reliable contact....reduce power? fine...but if the other station has to give
>valid signal reports first...

``...as little power as possible'' means to use the least power needed
for a reliable contact! Otherwise to run as little as possible would
mean 0 Watts - ridiculous!

When I said for you to reduce power 50% I was assuming the other guy
had first given a signal report, and will continue to report your signal
strength at each stage of your power reduction; on each exchange reduce
the power just a bit and see what he says. You'll be quite suprised.

Jeff

Date: Mon, 3 Oct 1994 15:15:01 GMT
From: barron@rmc.liant.com (Robert Barron)
Subject: Is this a Part 97 violation?

In <36l3it\$fmo@jupiter.planet.net>, billsohl@earth.planet.net (Bill Sohl Budd Lake) writes:

>The business restrictions section was recently changed (relaxed)
>by the FCC and, in my opinion, your infrequent use of the autopatch
>as described above should be perfectly OK today.

True but the restriction about the control operator being paid to perform a job using Amateur Radio is still not allowed. Unless you're the control op for W1AW!

>The nonprofit or commercial nature of the infrequent business use
>is not of any consequence.

True again. It does not matter if the organization is a for-profit or non-profit group. It matters whether the control op gets paid.

73,
Robert, KA5WSS
barron@rmc.liant.com

Date: 3 Oct 1994 17:33:40 GMT
From: jfilner@reed.edu (jfilner)
Subject: Is this a Part 97 violation?

Just to clarify my previous post. My pager is designated an emergency pager. I am only paged when one of the alarms is in an "off-normal" state. They don't page me that often, and most of the time it turns out not to be emergency. I have to respond to every page as if it is one, because you don't know until after you've checked everything out. I'm not really planning to use my radio for this, as anytime I'm really going to be out of touch someone else gets the pager. I just wanted to see what other people thought about it.

I also volunteer to help out with radioactive materials spills and other emergencies, and I don't see any problem with using my radio as part of my volunteer activities.

Thanks to everyone who responded to my post.

73 de KC7FSZ

End of line...
(jfilner@reed.edu)

Date: 3 Oct 1994 16:42:19 GMT
From: myers@Cypress.West.Sun.Com (Dana Myers)
Subject: Necessary power (was Re: Glass houses)

In article 5M5@news.Hawaii.Edu, jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:
>myers@Cypress.West.Sun.Com writes:

>
>>jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:
>
>>>Remember that the regulations **require** that we run as little
>>>power as possible!
>
>>Strictly speaking, I recall the regulations state we are to run the minimum
>>power necessary for communication. Though the case is often that amateurs are
>>using too much power, I've also heard many amateurs using less than the minimum
>>power necessary for communication, too.
>
>Then it's a simple matter to ask them to increase power, isn't it?
>Unless, of course, they can't because they're already running the
>maximum they're capable of. But this begs the question of why you
>would enter into a QSO with them in the first place if they were
>too weak for reliable comms.

Hmmm... are you questioning why one would enter into a conversation
with another station, even if they're a little weak? Are you really a
QRP enthusiast? When I hear weak signals, especially around the
recognized QRP frequencies, I always try to work them. Sure, I may not
be able to maintain reliable communications with the station, but
ignoring the signal simply because it is weak sounds a little extreme
to me.

If everybody ignored weak signals, or signals not able to be reliably
received, QRP enthusiasts would have fewer contacts, possibly by a
large margin. I'm wondering why you'd even raise the question in the
first place...

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD#: j | Views expressed here are

*

* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily *

* Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer

*

* "Sir, over there.... is that a man?"

*

Date: 3 Oct 1994 13:33:07 GMT

From: myers@Cypress.West.Sun.Com (Dana Myers)

Subject: Necessary power (was Re: Glass houses and those who live in the)

In article MF2@news.Hawaii.Edu, jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:
>Remember that the regulations *require* that we run as little
>power as possible!

Strictly speaking, I recall the regulations state we are to run the minimum power necessary for communication. Though the case is often that amateurs are using too much power, I've also heard many amateurs using less than the minimum power necessary for communication, too.

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD#: j | Views expressed here are

*

* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily *

* Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer

*

* "Sir, over there.... is that a man?" *

Date: Mon, 3 Oct 1994 10:07:15 UNDEFINED

From: kevin.jessup@meipws.mis.mei.com (Kevin Jessup)

Subject: Necessary power (was Re: Glass houses and those who live in the)

In article <36p16j\$02o@abyss.West.Sun.COM> myers@Cypress.West.Sun.Com (Dana Myers) writes:

>From: myers@Cypress.West.Sun.Com (Dana Myers)

>Subject: Necessary power (was Re: Glass houses and those who live in the)

>Date: 3 Oct 1994 13:33:07 GMT

>In article MF2@news.Hawaii.Edu, jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:
>>Remember that the regulations *require* that we run as little
>>power as possible!

>Strictly speaking, I recall the regulations state we are to run the minimum
>power necessary for communication.

And if that means cranking up the power so as to wipe out the other guy? Oh well, let 'er rip! Welcome to HF. :-[

```
/`- _      kevin.jessup@mail.mei.com |  
{      }/ Marquette Electronics, Inc | Time for another tea party!  
\      / Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA |
```

|__*| N9SQB, ARRL, Amateur Radio |

Date: Mon, 3 Oct 1994 15:56:26 GMT
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
Subject: Necessary power (was Re: Glass houses and those who live in the)

myers@Cypress.West.Sun.Com writes:

>jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>>Remember that the regulations *require* that we run as little
>>power as possible!

>Strictly speaking, I recall the regulations state we are to run the minimum
>power necessary for communication. Though the case is often that amateurs are
>using too much power, I've also heard many amateurs using less than the minimum
>power necessary for communication, too.

Then it's a simple matter to ask them to increase power, isn't it?
Unless, of course, they can't because they're already running the
maximum they're capable of. But this begs the question of why you
would enter into a QSO with them in the first place if they were
too weak for reliable comms.

Jeff

Date: 4 Oct 1994 00:08:09 GMT
From: eckman@eos1.larc.nasa.gov (Richard Eckman)
Subject: Scarborough Reef - DXCC status

I just received the new issue of "QRZ DX", a DX information
weekly bulletin, which contained an open letter from
Chip Margelli, K7JA, regarding Scarborough Reef and its
DXCC status. In the letter, Chip implores active DXers to
open discussion on the issue. I feel compelled to add a few words.

Recently, the DXAC voted to change the DXCC rules in
an attempt to define a minimum size for a DXCC country.
I imagine that this was due to the Scarborough application
and the potential for similar applications for DXCC country status.

I've been struck by the
strange attitudes of many hams towards the DXCC institution.
It's certainly a worthy goal for a DXer to work and verify
100 countries. Some may argue it's too easy these days,

given the plethora of "countries" to choose from. Yet, there seems to be no end to the hams with their compasses and rulers seeking to find yet another speck of rock as a potential candidate for DXCC status. To me, this is a pity. It brings the concept of DXCC into ridicule, particularly from non-DXers when frivolous, ill-considered applications are brought before the DXAC for consideration. There is enough political volatility in the world to ensure that new DXCC countries will continue to be formed (and perhaps deleted) as countries fracture or otherwise redefine themselves. It seems unnecessary to "help" the process along by finding a rock in the Pacific to call a new DXCC "country".

Chip's arguments for the acceptance of Scarborough Reef seem to center around the Chinese Radio Sport Association's efforts in organizing the recent DXpedition. The CRSA's efforts are certainly commendable, but I fail to see how the acceptance/non-acceptance of the reef's DXCC status will impact on the future of Chinese or Asian ham radio growth. The argument seems wholly fallacious.

Chip states that Scarborough "clearly fell within the DXCC country qualification specifications." But the reef is barely more than a few rocks, sometimes above water at low tide. To accept such a landmass as a DXCC country is lunacy and invites tremendous potential abuse from a myriad of future applications for any rock that meets the minimum land separation requirements from its parent country. I'm personally thrilled that the DXAC voted to revise country size requirements before this issue gets entirely out of hand.

I'm all for working another new DXCC country. But, let's use some common sense and not warp the rules of the DXCC.

Richard Eckman K04MR
Hampton, VA
eckman@eos1.larc.nasa.gov

Date: 3 Oct 1994 10:03:16 -0700
From: kchen@apple.com (Kok Chen)
Subject: Singapore's Ham Laws (or: we've got it easy in the US)

s2202629@np.ac.sg (Teh Aik Wen) writes:

>Daniel sure got his facts right - I'm in Singapore too, and I'm presently
>down the same road he is - hunting down extinct 2m rigs to get my restricted
>license.

>I would just like to know, but is there _anywhere_ else in this world, that

>is _that_ difficult to get an amateur radio license? (With such high costs?)

Oh yes; but maybe not for this day and age. Thailand in the late 1950s, when I started building radios, did not allow amateur radio, at any cost.

Malaya in the early 1960s wasn't any better, at least for me. Minors (def: under 21) who are also aliens (the earthly kind, that is) were not permitted to become hams. I had to salivate at the transmitter projects in the ARRL Handbook and QST which I found in the Kuala Lumpur USIS library.

I had to wait until I came to the Land of the Free, Home of the Brave, to get a license. Even the U.S. was quite restrictive when I arrived on these shores in the mid-60s - U.S. citizens only.

>Minimum age requirement to apply for an ham license in Singapore : 16.
>(Formerly 18).

Now, this is really *stupid.* The time to introduce technology to youngsters is when they are young. What do the bright kids do? Become lawyers? :-)

>Cool isn't it?
>Ugh.

Uh oh. How many strokes of the cane is that? :-)

Selamat tinggal di-negara Singapura, lah. :-) :-)

73,

Kok Chen, AA6TY
Apple Computer, Inc.

kchen@apple.com

Date: 3 Oct 1994 14:43:21 GMT
From: little@iamu.chi.dec.com (Todd Little)

References<Cx1KA3.wo@news.Hawaii.Edu> <36mtnd\$iqs@nntpd.lkg.dec.com>,
<Cx29r1.9M1@news.Hawaii.Edu>
Reply-To: little@iamu.chi.dec.com (Todd Little)
Subject: Re: Get Over It

In article <Cx29r1.9M1@news.Hawaii.Edu>, jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:
|>In article <36mtnd\$iqs@nntpd.lkg.dec.com> little@iamu.chi.dec.com (Todd Little) writes:
|>>
|>>In article <Cx1KA3.wo@news.Hawaii.Edu>, jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:
|>>
|>>|>CW has historically been more prevalent on HF than on V/UHF; maybe
|>>|>this is because the HF bands were first occupied with CW - other
|>>|>modes and other bands came later. Thus, CW on HF became the norm.
|>>
|>>Has become "the norm" on some segments of the HF bands. Given that
|>>CW and data are the predominate mode on less than half the HF allocations,
|>>and CW is generally found in less than half that allocation, stop
|>>trying to imply that CW is the predominate mode. It's not. Maybe you
|>>believe that restating this misfact often enough will cause it to become
|>>fact, but fortunately the truth doesn't work that way.
|>
|>Hey, good job of twisting my words, Todd! You deleted someone else's
|>query as to why CW is prevalent on HF and not on VHF and above.
|>NOW maybe my statement will make more sense to you.

Wasn't meant to twist your words. "Thus, CW on HF became the norm." can be interpreted at *least* two different ways. Given that you make the claim of Morse code's domination of the HF bands at nearly every opportunity, I took it to mean "CW is the normal mode of communication on HF" as opposed to "The HF bands is where most CW operation occurs."

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: Mon, 3 Oct 1994 19:01:43 GMT
From: dtiller@cscsun.rmc.edu (David Tiller)

References<366qha\$dgl@jupiter.planet.net>
<mitchr-2609941200340001@pacsci-20.pacsci.org>, <367mij\$1pm@chnews.intel.com>
Subject: Re: Get Over It

Cecil_A_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com wrote:
: In article <mitchr-2609941200340001@pacsci-20.pacsci.org>,
: Mitch Robinson <mitchr@admin.pacsci.org> wrote:

: >I have been trying for 10 years to get up to 13 wpm, with very little
: >success. You see, I have a definite problem with patterns, very similar

: >to dyslexia. For example, when I hear a Q, Y, F, or L, I immediately know
: >that ONE of them was sent, but not WHICH one. However, the way the
: >Handicapped provision is written, I don't qualify for the waiver.

: Hi Mitch, I wouldn't be on HF either if I had to copy CW without pencil
: and paper. I can't even copy 1 wpm in my head because of brain damage from
: a car wreck years ago. My CW buffer got wiped out.

: Does your pattern problem work in reverse? ie. can you transmit at 13wpm?
: If so, you may be able to find an examiner who will let you transmit
: instead of receive. I know someone similarly Morsely-challenged who recently
: upgraded from tech+ to general by taking a CW sending test.

Doesn't the rule say "must be able to copy by ear?" I can send faster than
greased lightning, but I can't receive worth a darn. (See previous post).
I can send machine perfect at 20wpm (according to my pk232), but after 5 years
of fighting 13wpm, I'm at about 8.

--

David Tiller	Network Administrator	Voice: (804) 752-3710
dtiller@rmc.edu n2kau/4	Randolph-Macon College	Fax: (804) 752-7231
"Drunk, [Beowulf] slew no	P.O. Box 5005	ICBM: 37d 42' 43.75" N
hearth companions."	Ashland, Va 23005	77d 31' 32.19" W

Date: Mon, 3 Oct 1994 18:59:12 GMT
From: dtiller@cscsun.rmc.edu (David Tiller)

References<p8514wr.edellers@delphi.com> <366qha\$dgl@jupiter.planet.net>,
<mitchr-2609941200340001@pacsci-20.pacsci.org>
Subject: Re: Get Over It

Mitch Robinson (mitchr@admin.pacsci.org) wrote:

: I have been reading this newsgroup for only a couple of days, but am
: dissappointed by the flaming going on... I especially take offense at the
: messages that denigrate No-Code Techs and/or "appliance operators".

: I hold a Technician license, received in 1984. Long before "enhancement",
: the only reason I am not a General is because of my lack of ability to
: pass the 13. If it were not for the code requirements, I would be an
: extra. The written tests are a breeze for me.

: I have been trying for 10 years to get up to 13 wpm, with very little
: success. You see, I have a definite problem with patterns, very similar
: to dyslexia. For example, when I hear a Q, Y, F, or L, I immediately know
: that ONE of them was sent, but not WHICH one. However, the way the

: Handicapped provision is written, I don't qualify for the waiver.

: CW is an extremely difficult mode for me to work with. I get absolutely no
: enjoyment from it, and don't expect to ever use it in "real life". Why
: should I? In over 10 years I have YET to see (actually, hear) any
: instance where code was used except by individuals using it for fun and/or
: practice traffic. Never in any emergency situations.

I'm in exactly the same boat!!! I hear them inverted dit for dah, and
forward for back all at the same time!!! I'm still plugging away, though!
I wonder what the heck it's called, if this "condition" has a name yet?
Strange....

--

David Tiller	Network Administrator	Voice: (804) 752-3710	
dtiller@rmc.edu n2kau/4	Randolph-Macon College	Fax: (804) 752-7231	
"Drunk, [Beowulf] slew no	P.O. Box 5005	ICBM: 37d 42' 43.75" N	
hearth companions."	Ashland, Va 23005	77d 31' 32.19" W	

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #476
